

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Support for new claims 13 is found, for example, in Example 1 at pages 12-13 of the specification.

Unity of Invention Requirement

The claims of the present PCT application have been grouped as follows:

Group I -- Claims 1-5;

Group II -- Claims 6-8;

Group III -- Claims 9/(1-5);

Group IV -- Claims 9/(6-8);

Group V -- Claims 10 and 12/10; and

Group VI -- Claims 11 and 12/11.

Election

In response to the above-noted Unity of Invention Requirement, Applicants hereby elect the claims of Group V, including at least claims 10 and 12. It is additionally submitted that new claim 13 should also be examined together with the elected subject matter, since unity exists between claims 10 and 13. Note Example 5 of the Administrative Instructions Under the PCT, Annex B, Part 2, Examples Concerning Unity of Invention, page AI-58 of the MPEP.

In response to the Election of Species Requirement, Applicants elect the following species corresponding to the species listed in paragraph (5) on page 3 of the Office Action:

(a) and (b): A fluoroelastomer and a polyol as used in Example 1;

(c): FEP (TFE/HFP copolymer) as used in Example 9;

(e): Polyimide; and

(f): PFA (TFE-perfluoroalkyl vinyl ether copolymer).

All of the above-noted elections are made with traverse. First, it is submitted that the Unity of Invention Requirement is improper in view of the fact that it is irrelevant whether the initial position of the Examiner is that claim 1 is not patentable over the prior art. Note that there was no Unity of Invention Requirement issued in connection with the International Preliminary Examination Report. Additionally, it is submitted that the Election of Species Requirement is improper since there is no undue burden placed on the Examiner to examine the generic elements of the claims as presently recited in elected claims 10 and 12. It is requested that the United of Invention and Election of Species Requirements be withdrawn.

If any questions arise in connection with the above matters, please contact Applicants' representative, Andrew D. Meikle in the Washington metropolitan area at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this,

Application No.: 09/623,010

concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully Submitted

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Andrew D. Meikle
Reg. No. 32,868

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA. 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

ADM/bsh